May 17, 1977

SENATOR FOWLER: Well I may be wrong on this, but I think the chemical dependency program right now that we have is at the maximum security unit. I'm not sure that it's... I probably shouldn't say this for certain, but I don't think there is one at the Reformatory right now.

SENATOR KELLY: Thank you very much, Senator Fowler. It would appear to me that setting in statute at this time the need for a chemical dependency unit at each Reformatory is more or less an exercise in futility. They're going to be there anyway. We recognize alcoholism for what it is. We recognize drunkeness for what it is. They both create crime. Crime creates criminals, and that makes prisons, and that is what we're talking about. I really don't see where there is any merit in tying down a given number of beds, in a reformatory, for an alcohol dependency unit, because there will be, there's got to be a program in that institution. If it would be needing the 64 beds it would take them. If it needs 30 beds it would take them. As I understand, from Senator Fowler's remarks and Senator Mills, basically what we're doing is setting aside this particular unit, number 64 beds, that would be for alcohol programs and alcohol only. This, with 256 teds maximum, it seems to me that this becomes a limiting factor and just doesn't quite measure up to the flexibility that management should have in the operation of the Reformatory. Mr. President, I have a question of Senator Mills.

SENATOR BARNETT: Senator Mills.

SENATOR MILLS: Yes sir.

SENATOR KELLY: Senator Mills, I would be very anxious to know what it was you were going to tell us if Senator Barnett hadn't interrupted you.

SENATOR MILLS: Thank you. I'm certainly happy you were listening. Senator Kelly, the point that concerns me, and I'm sure that Senator Fowler has the same concern. He has more background of the fiscal note of it because of his working on the Appropriations Committee. He has worked with the penal institutions, and I appreciate his concern there, and I applaud him for his work. The point that I am concerned about, Senator Kelly, is just exactly what Senator Fowler is trying to do, but I don't believe, and I think there is a number of people that don't believe that that institution is large enough to accomodate what Senator Fowler is trying to do. There are 256 beds going to be built in a new reformatory from LB 417 passed in 1975. That is the law. Now we have a chemical dependency program. Of course, it should be there, and I think everyone supports that. It is just how will we do it, and how will we provide enough room at that particular place. Senator Kelly, I know there are people on the streets, and you know that, that the judges would like to have sent to an institution, a penal reformatory, but we're concerned because of the conditions that are there. They are so bad. They need a chemical dependency program, and they also need these facilities. I am not for providing a Hilton Hotel for these persons, but I actually believe if any person in the State of Nebraska with rationale went to the State Reformatory today he or she would agree that this Legislature made the proper decision in passing 417. I believe that we should go on further, because those figures were outdated at that particular time, or they are outdated now. The population has grown. It is showing that we need extra room at that reformatory, and we need what Senator